

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 29, 2005. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 23 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 3-4, 7-9, 12-15, 17-21 and 23-25 have been amended. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowance of Claims 1, 2, 6 and 11. Additionally, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of Claims 3-5, 8-10 and 12-16 if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections, and for indicating the allowability of Claims 17-25 if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action dated March 29, 2005.

I. Objection to the Drawings

The Drawings are objected to because “CLK8” and “CLK16” shown in FIG. 7 should be labeled as because “CLK8D” and “CLK16D”, respectively. A corrected FIG. 7, labeled as “Replacement Sheet” is provided.

II. Objection to the Specification

As per Examiner’s request, page 4, line 6 of the specification has been amended to now indicate issuance of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/921,866 as U.S. Patent No. 6,483,360 B2.

Additionally, the specification has been amended to correct a typographic error on page 13, line 6, namely reference number “1” should be “2”.

Regarding the objection to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter recited in Claim 17, lines 6 through 8. Support for the claimed subject matter is found on page 6 lines 10 through 12 of the disclosure. Both the language in Claim 17

and the language in the cited portion of the specification are essentially identical. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

III. Objection to Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 16-25

Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 16-25 are objected to because of informalities. The Claims have been amended according to Examiner's suggestions.

IV. Rejection of Claims 17-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 17, 23, 24 and 25 have been amended in a manner believed to obviate the rejection.

Amended Claim 17 recites in part: "...a first set of clock signals having a first condensation portion among said compression multi-phase clock signals is phase locked with a phase of a transition point of said input data; and controlling a phase of said compression multi-phase clock signals so as to avoid making a phase of one of two clock edges in a second set of clock signals having a second condensation portion among said compression multi-phase clock signals are phase locked with the phase of the transition point of said input data, said second set of clock signals being adjacent to said first set of clock signals through a rarefaction portion." (Emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant believes Claim 17, as amended, clarifies the difference of "a condensation portion".

Claim 23 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis of "said clock signals". Amended Claim 23 recites in part: "a phase comparison portion for sampling an input data using clock signals produced by said second delay locked loop and clock signals produced by said third delay locked loop to detect lag/lead of said clock signals produced by said second delay locked

loop and said clock signals produced by said third delay locked loop in reference with said input data, said phase comparison portion producing a comparison result indicative of the lag/lead of said clock signals; and a control circuit for controlling said first through said fourth selection circuits on the basis of said comparison result”

Claim 24 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis for “said delay buffers” as follows: “An oversampling clock recovery circuit as claimed in claim 23, wherein resolution of a phase control is set so as to be smaller than a propagation delay in said m-stage and n-stage delay buffers, said control circuit carrying out the phase control so as to differ by one resolution between said first and said third selection circuits and said second and said fourth selection circuits.” (Emphasis added).

Claim 25 has been amended to clarify the meaning of “a first stage thereof”. Amended Claim 25 recites: “...a first delay line having said third selected delay buffer as a first stage delay buffer in said first delay line, and said third delay locked loop compares phases of input and output signals in a second delay line having said fourth selected delay buffer as a first stage delay buffer in said second delay line.” (Emphasis added).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-25 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Please see attached replacement FIG. 7.